

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 00274 01 OF 02 211301Z

53

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 USIE-00

INRE-00 AEC-05 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-07 IO-10 L-02 NSAE-00

OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02

SS-15 TRSE-00 RSC-01 NSC-05 BIB-01 /082 W

----- 108195

O R 211050Z JAN 75 ZFF-4

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 9651

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USDEL MBFR VIENNA

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 0274

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJ:MBFR: SPC DISCUSSION JANUARY 20 ON EASTERN FREEZE PROPOSAL

REF: A. STATE 11498 B. STATE 12465

SUMMARY

SPC ON JANUARY 20 DISCUSSED DEFINITIVE ALLIED REACTION TO EASTERN FREEZE PROPOSAL. US REP INTRODUCED US POSITION (REF A) ON WHICH MISSION HAD BRIEFED MOST DELEGATIONS ON JANUARY 17. IK AND NETHERLANDS PROPOSED DRAFT GUIDANCE TO AHG WHICH CONTAINS MUCH OF THE LANGUAGE IN US DRAFT GUIDANCE INCLUDING UNACCEPTABILITY OF EASTERN PROPOSAL. HOWEVER UK TEXT WENT ON TO MAKE COUNTER-PROPOSAL BASED ON EXISTING ALLIED NON-INCREASE OFFERS, WHILE DUTCH TEXT INCLUDED A UNILATERAL DECLARATION THAT THE ALLIES DID NOT INTEND TO INCREASE FORCE LEVELS WHILE THE NEGOTIATIONS CONTINUED. BELGIAN REP ALSO INTRODUCED A PROPOSAL FOR A UNILATERAL NON-INCREASE DECLARATION. ALLIES REMAIN
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 00274 01 OF 02 211301Z

GENERALLY OPPOSED TO TOTAL REJECTION, AND SOME EXPRESSED THE BELIEF THAT A JOINING OF ELEMENTS FROM U.S. AND UK TEXTS COULD LEAD TO AGREED GUIDANCE. END SUMMARY

1. MISSION ON JANUARY 17 HAD BRIEFED ALL DELEGATIONS, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF FRANCE, PORTUGAL, ICELAND, AND LUXEMBOURG, ON THE US POSITION ON EASTERN FREEZE PROPOSAL AS CONTAINED IN REF A, AND HAD GIVEN THEM A COPY OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE TO THE AHG PROPOSED IN THAT MESSAGE. AT JANUARY 20 SPC MEETING, US REP (PEREZ) INTRODUCED THE US POSITION. HE NOTED THE DEFECTS IN THE EASTERN FREEZE PROPOSAL AND SAID THAT THE US STRONGLY BELIEVES THAT THE ALLIES SHOULD REJECT THAT PROPOSAL OUTRIGHT, RATHER THAN PUT FORTH A COUNTER-PROPOSAL. HE EMPHASIZED THE MAIN POINTS IN REF A, AND IN PARTICULAR (DRAWING ON REF B AS WELL) THAT THE US PROPOSAL WOULD EFFECTIVELY DEAL WITH PUBLIC OPINION IF THE EASTERN FREEZE PROPOSAL BECAME PUBLIC. IN CONCLUDING, HE ASSURED THE SPC THAT THE US HAD ARRIVED AT ITS POSITION ONLY AFTER EXTENSIVE CONSULTATION AND DELIBERATION, AND THAT THE POSITION WAS SUPPORTED AT HIGHEST LEVELS OF US GOVERNMENT. HE THEN DISTRIBUTED PAPER BASED ON REFS A AND B.

2. BELGIAN REP (WILLOT SAID HIS AUTHORITIES CONSIDER THE SOVIET PROPOSAL UNACCEPTABLE, RECOGNIZE THAT PUBLIC OPINION IN SEVERAL ALLIED COUNTRIES PREVENTS OUTRIGHT REJECTION, AND BELIEVE THAT THE ALLIES NEED TO REPLY TO THE EAST IN A WAY WHICH AVOIDS NEGOTIATION OF THE TERMS OF A FREEZE. BELGIUM DOES NOT LIKE THE NEW UK COUNTER-PROPOSAL, BECAUSE IT DOES NOT RESPOND TO THE SOVIET PROPOSAL, AND BECAUSE NOTHING WOULD PREVENT THE OTHER SIDE FROM USING THE UK COUNTER-PROPOSAL TO ENGAGE THE ALLIES IN NEGOTIATION ON TERMS OF A FREEZE. BELGIAN REP SAID HE THOUGHT THE US PROPOSAL RAISED THE SAME PROBLEMS. BELGIUM THEREFORE WANTED TO PROPOSE, AS AN ALTERNATIVE TO OUTRIGHT REJECTION AND PROLONGED NEGOTIATION, THAT THE ALLIES MAKE A UNILATERAL DECLARATION NOT TO INCREASE OVERALL GROUND FORCE AND AIR MANPOWER DURING THE COURSE OF THE NEGOTIATION. AN ALLIED DIRECT PARTICIPANT, ON BEHALF OF THE OTHER ALLIED DIRECT PARTICIPANTS, WOULD MAKE THE UNILATERAL DECLARATION AT A PLENARY SESSION IN VIENNA. THE ALLIES WOULD LET THE OTHER SIDE KNOW THAT THEY WERE WILLING TO UNDERTAKE SUCH A FREEZE, PROVIDED THAT THE OTHER SIDE TOOK AN ACTION WITH THE SAME RESULTS. THIS WOULD PUT AN END TO DEBATE IN VIENNA ON THE EASTERN FREEZE PROPOSAL, AND NO OTHER COURSE, NOT EVEN OUTRIGHT
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 00274 01 OF 02 211301Z

REJECTIONS WOULD DO THIS.

3. NETHERLANDS REP (BUWALDA) NOTED THAT THE USMISSION HAD MADE CLEAR TO NETHERLANDS DELEGATION ON JANUARY 17 THAT US STRONGLY FAVORED OUTRIGHT REJECTION OF EASTERN PROPOSAL, AND HAD GIVEN NETHERLANDS DELEGATION A COPY OF PROPOSED DRAFT GUIDANCE TO THE AHG. NETHERLANDS BELIEVES NATO MUST MAKE A DECISION REGARDING THE EASTERN PROPOSAL IN THE SHORTEST POSSIBLE TIME. NETHERLANDS ALSO SAW SOME BENEFIT IN BELGIAN IDEA OF A UNILATERAL DECLARATION.

(COMMENT: BELGIAN REP HAD EXPRESSED THIS IDEA INFORMALLY AT A PREVIOUS SPC MEETING.)

THE HAGUE THEREFORE COULD ACCEPT VIRTUALLY ALL
OF THE LANGUAGE IN THE US DRAFT GUIDANCE TO THE AHG,
INCLUDING THE STATEMENT THAT THE EASTERN PROPOSAL WAS NOT ACCEPTABLE,
BUT WITH THE INCLUSION OF A SENTENCE STATING THAT THE ALLIES HAVE NO
INTENTION OF INCREASING THEIR FORCES IN THE NGA WHILE THE
NEGOTIATIONS GO ON IN A CONSTRUCTIVE WAY, AND WHILE THE
EASTERN SIDE IS ACTING LIKEWISE.

4. UK REP (LOGAN) SAID UK STILL OPPOSES OUTRIGHT REJECTION
AND FAVORS A COUNTER-PROPOSAL BASED ON EXISTING ALLIED NON-
INCREASE PROPOSALS. HE SAID THAT OUTRIGHT REJECTION WOULD NOT STOP
THE OTHER SIDE FROM DISCUSSING ITS FREEZE PROPOSAL, BUT WOULD ONLY
HURT ALLIES WITH PUBLIC OPINION IF THE EASTERN PROPOSAL
BECAME PUBLIC. A COUNTER-PROPOSAL COULD HELP TURN THE DISCUSSION
TO ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF THE ALLIED POSITION, E.G., AND EXCHANGE
OF DATA. HE CRITICIZED THE BELGIAN PROPOSAL FOR A UNILATERAL
DECLARATION ON GROUNDS THAT A FREEZE REQUIRES AGREED DATA,
WITHOUT WHICH THE OTHER SIDE COULD EASILY CRITICIZE ANYTHING
THE ALLIES DID, WITHOUT GIVING THE ALLIES ANY REAL CONTROL ON
THE EAST. UK REP, ON PERSONAL BASIS, SAID THAT IF ALLIES RE-
JECTED THE EASTERN FREEZE PROPOSAL OUTRIGHT, AND THIS BECAME
PUBLIC, THE PRESS WOULD PROBABLY BLAME THE EUROPEANS, SINCE THE US
HAD ACCEPTED A FREEZE ON STRATEGIC SYSTEMS IN SALT, WHICH EVEN
PERMITTED THE OTHER SIDE SOME INCREASE. UK REP THEN INTRODUCED
A PROPOSAL OF DRAFT GUIDANCE TO THE AHG TO IMPLEMENT THE UK IDEA OF
A COUNTER-PROPOSAL, AND TAKING INTO CONSIDERATION THE
US DRAFT GUIDANCE. (COMMENT: THE UK DRAFT GUIDANCE INCLUDES
MUCH OF THE LANGUAGE IN THE US DRAFT GUIDANCE, INCLUDING THE
SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 00274 01 OF 02 211301Z

STATEMENT THAT THE EASTERN PROPOSAL IS NOT ACCEPTABLE.
HOWEVER THE UK DRAFT GUIDANCE THEN GOES ON TO PROPOSE, AS A
COUNTER-PROPOSAL TO THE EASTERN FREEZE PROPOSAL, CERTAIN ELEMENTS
OF THE ALLIED NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT, TO COME INTO EFFECT
AS SOON AS AGREEMENT ON PHASE I REDUCTIONS HAS BEEN REACHED.)

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 00274 02 OF 02 211232Z

53

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 USIE-00

INRE-00 AEC-05 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-07 IO-10 L-02 NSAE-00

OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02

SS-15 TRSE-00 RSC-01 NSC-05 BIB-01 /082 W

----- 107971

O R 211050Z JAN 75 ZFF-4
FM USMISSION NATO
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 9654
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
USDEL MBFR VIENNA
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 0274

5. US REP SAID THAT HE WOULD OF COURSE REPORT THE BELGIAN AND NETHERLANDS PROPOSALS REGARDING UNILATERAL DECLARATIONS, AND HE KNEW THAT WASHINGTON WOULD GIVE THEM CAREFUL STUDY. HOWEVER, ON A PERSONAL BASIS, HE POINTED OUT THAT THESE PROPOSALS MIGHT SATISFY SOVIET INTERNAL REQUIREMENTS FOR PROGRESS ON MBFR PRIOR TO THE MEETING OF COMMUNIST PARTIES, AND MIGHT THEREFORE LESSEN SOVIET INTEREST IN REDUCTIONS. THESE TWO PROPOSALS WOULD ALSO GIVE THE SOVIETS A PROPAGANDA HANDLE TO COMPLAIN ABOUT RESTRUCTURING OF ALLIED FORCES AND AN INCREASE OF US FORCES UP TO AUTHORIZED STRENGTH. HE SAID THAT HE HAD THE SAME QUESTION AS THE UK REP ABOUT THE VALUE OF A UNILATERAL FREEZE IN THE ABSENCE OF DATA.

6. BELGIAN REP SAID HIS AUTHORITIES WERE CONCERNED THAT IF A FREEZE ACCORD CONTAINED PRECISE DATA, THE ALLIES WOULD ALSO HAVE TO ASK FOR AGREEMENT ON VERIFICATION, IN ORDER TO AVOID THE BAD PRECEDENT OF A PRECISE DISARMAMENT AGREEMENT WITHOUT VERIFICATION. THE BELGIAN PROPOSAL OBVIATES THE NEED TO HAVE AGREEMENT ON VERIFICATION FOR THE FREEZE. HE STRESSED THAT AGH WOULD PRESENT THE
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 00274 02 OF 02 211232Z

UNILATERAL DECLARATION BY IN EFFECT SAYING TO THE EAST "THIS IS IT, IF YOU DO THE SAME", IN ORDER TO AVOID GETTING INTO A NEGOTIATION ON TERMS.

7. CANADIAN REP (ROY) QUESTIONED HOW THE BELGIAN AND NETHERLANDS PROPOSALS OF UNILATERAL DECLARATIONS OF A FREEZE WOULD HELP SOLVE THE PUBLIC OPINION PROBLEM. HE SAID THAT THE PUBLIC WOULD PROBABLY NOT UNDERSTAND WHY THE ALLIES WERE MAKING A UNILATERAL NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT, INSTEAD OF ACCEPTING THE SOVIET PROPOSAL, OR NEGOTIATING WITH THE EAST ON A COMMITMENT WHICH WOULD BIND BOTH SIDES. HE THOUGHT THAT THE US AND UK TEXTS ON DRAFT GUIDANCE NOW SHARED MANY POINTS IN COMMON, AND THOUGHT THAT THE WAY FOR NATO TO AGREE ON GUIDANCE TO THE AHG WAS TO FIND A WAY OF BRIDGING THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE US AND UK PROPOSALS.

8. FRG REP (HOYNCK) SAID HE HAD NO INSTRUCTIONS ON THE US AND UK PROPOSALS. ON A PERSONAL BASIS, HE CRITICIZED THE IDEA OF UNILATERAL DECLARATIONS OF A FREEZE ON THE SAME GROUNDS AS PREVIOUS SPEAKERS, WHILE ADDING THE POINT THAT THE BELGIAN AND NETHERLANDS

PROPOSALS WOULD TEND TO FREEZE THE DISPARITIES AND PREJUDICE THE NEGOTIATION AGAINST THE COMMON CEILING. HE AGREED WITH CANADIAN REP THAT PUTTING ELEMENTS OF US AND UK PROPOSALS TOGETHER WAS THE WAY TO GET GUIDANCE TO THE AGH.

9. DANISH REP (VILLADSEN) SAID HIS AUTHORITIES ALSO BELIEVED THAT SIMPLY TELLING THE OTHER SIDE THAT THE EASTERN PROPOSAL WAS UNACCEPTABLE WOULD NOT PREVENT THE EAST FROM DISCUSSING ITS PROPOSAL. DENMARK LIKED THE UK APPROACH, WHICH OPENED UP THE POSSIBILITY OF USING THE EASTERN PROPOSAL TO DISCUSS ELEMENTS OF THE ALLIED POSITION. DANISH REP SAID HE DID NOT CONSIDER THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE US TEXT AND THE UK TEXT TO BE INSURMOUNTABLE, AND HE WAS SURE THAT DENMARK WOULD SUPPORT WHICHEVER APPROACH WAS SATISFACTORY TO THOSE ALLIES MOST DIRECTLY CONCERNED.

10. ITALIAN REP (SPINELLI) SAID HE WAS WITHOUT INSTRUCTIONS. HE KNEW THAT HI AUTHORITIES WOULD PREFER REJECTION, BUT IF A COUNTER-PROPOSAL IS NECESSARY, HE THOUGHT THEY WOULD BE ABLE TO SUPPORT THE UK TEXT. NORWEGIAN REP (SELMER) SAID HE THOUGHT NORWEGIAN GOVERNMENT COULD HANDLE ITS PUBLIC OPINION IF
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 00274 02 OF 02 211232Z

IT COULD EXPLAIN THAT THE ALLIES HAD TURNED DOWN THE EASTERN FREEZE PROPOSAL BECAUSE THEY WANTED A FREEZE IN CONNECTION WITH REDUCTIONS. WHAT PUBLIC OPINION WOULD NOT UNDERSTAND IS THE ABSENCE OF AN ALLIED POSITION WHEN IT IS NEEDED.

11. SPC WILL RETURN TO EASTERN FREEZE PROPOSAL ON THURSDAY, JANUARY 23.

12. COMMENT:
THIS SPC MEETING SAW SOME MOVEMENT TOWARD US VIEW THAT THE ALLIES SHOULD TELL THE EAST THAT THE EASTERN FREEZE PROPOSAL IS NOT ACCEPTABLE. THIS PHRASE APPEARS IN BOTH THE UK AND DUTCH VERSIONS OF DRAFT GUIDANCE TO AHG. HOWEVER UK VERSION GOES ON TO SPELL OUT THAT ALLIES ARE COUNTER-PROPOSING THE EARLIER ALLIED OFFERS OF NON-INCREASE COMMITMENTS, WHILE DUTCH VERSION INCLUDES UNILATERAL FREEZE DECLARATION. INITIAL REACTION OF SPC MEMBERS WAS UNFAVORABLE TO BELGIAN AND NETHERLANDS PROPOSALS OF UNILATERAL FREEZE DECLARATION. THE OTHER ALLIES REMAIN GENERALLY OPPOSED TO OUTRIGHT REJECTION OF THE EASTERN PROPOSAL. IT WAS CLEAR THAT SOME OF THE ALLIES ARE PLEASED WITH BOTH THE US TEXT (REF A) AND THE NEW UK TEXT, AND BELIEVE THAT EVENTUAL NAC GUIDANCE WILL REPRESENT A JOINING OF ELEMENTS FROM THE TWO TEXTS.

13. ACTION REQUESTED: WASHINGTON GUIDANCE ON THE UK, BELGIAN, AND NETHERLANDS TEXTS TRANSMITTED SEPTTEL, IN TIME FOR JANUARY 23 SPC.BRUCE

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 18 AUG 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 21 JAN 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: GolinoFR
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975NATO00274
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t19750188/abbrzhrl.tel
Line Count: 270
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 5
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A. STATE 11498 B. STATE 12465
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: GolinoFR
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 31 MAR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <31 MAR 2003 by BoyleJA>; APPROVED <02 APR 2003 by GolinoFR>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
05 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: SPC DISCUSSION JANUARY 20 ON EASTERN FREEZE PROPOSAL
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO BONN
LONDON
MBFR VIENNA
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

Type: TE

Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JUL 2006